

09/991,352

6

REMARKS

The applicant has amended claim 1 to include features not found in the prior art cited by the examiner.

The shape of the hopper is now claimed as having a bottom, which is sloped upward from the front to the rear. The frame of the conveyor belt is now claimed as triangular so that the material in the hopper is pushed forward along the base of the triangle, then lifted upward on a slope of the triangle from the leading apex to a rear raised apex and then dumped out of the hopper on the downward sloped rear portion of the triangle.

In Losessner the conveyor belt turns about a front and rear point and is flat, not a triangular frame as the applicants now claim. The conveyor pushes the material under the conveyor belt from the front to the rear under the conveyor belt where it is dropped into a spreader. Further the conveyor rear pivot point has to be lowered to remove all of the material from the wagon. The applicant keeps his rear pivot point in one location.

Similarly in Tucker the conveyor pushes the material under the conveyor belt to the rear of the hopper where it drops into a collection box in the bottom of the hopper and is fed by a second conveyor to a spreader. The applicant runs his conveyor from back to front to push material forward under the conveyor belt and then lifts the material up, on the top of the conveyor belt and over the back end of the triangular conveyor belt frame above the sloped bottom at the rear end to discharge the material from the rear of the hopper.

Neither Tucker or Loessner use the same shaped hopper or the same shaped conveyor frame and do not discharge the material the same way the applicant does. Therefore, claim 1, as now amended, is not anticipated by the references and is allowable.

09/991,352

7

All other claims are dependent from allowable claim 1 and are therefore also allowable.

The applicant believes all of the claims are now in condition for allowance.

Reconsideration is requested.